

31 JAN 1978

NOTE FOR: Chief, Plans and Programs Staff, OL

STATINTL

FROM:   
Executive Officer, OL

*Ike:*

1. Re the attached submittal responding to the House Select Committee, I find the following deficiencies:

a. I specifically requested that all staffs and divisions be queried on all questions. There is no indication that this was done. Further, I believe the memo to OLC should include a statement that we checked on all questions with negative response.

b. The note requested that PMS be checked with regarding the two contractor names to be researched in question 36. The routing documentation would indicate that PD was checked but not PMS.

c. The material in the Security Staff file refers to several task orders given to the contractor by TSS (OTS). The immediate question raised is whether we have a copy of these task orders in Records Center or if the OTS procurement team has any record of same.

d. The note from you on the top of the package asks whether the documents be released as is or sterilized. Paragraph 2 of the referent memo clearly spells out that all material will be reviewed by the Committee staff within OLC offices and that any notes taken down by the Committee staff will be classified and sanitized by OLC.

e. Your note further goes on that should the surfaced documents be withdrawn since 99% of the information is not pertinent. I don't presume to know precisely what the Committee on Assassinations is looking for and don't believe we are in any position to judge that which is pertinent. Further, I do not want to put the D/L in the position of saying he had withheld a large volume of documents because, in the judgment of his staff, they were considered not pertinent to the investigation.

2. Please rework as follows:

a. If you have not done so, coord with PMS and see what, if any, records they have on the two corporations.


b. Coord with the OTS procurement team to see if they have any records of the contract referred to in the Security Staff documents.

c. Both PMS and the OTS procurement team searches should include a review of records at the Records Center.

d. Rewrite the covering memo to include the following:

(1) A specific statement of whether the contract/task order is in our files or if we have any record of same.

(2) A statement that staffs and divisions within OL have been queried regarding the other 35 questions with negative responses.



STATINTL

Att

25X1

Approved For Release 2003/02/27 : CIA-RDP85-00759R000100020005-9

Approved For Release 2003/02/27 : CIA-RDP85-00759R000100020005-9

1 Feb 78

# Memorandum For the Record:

Subject: HSCA Request

1. The following comments are made relative to the Note from EO/OL dated 31 Jan 1978.

On 23 January at the D/L RAP session (attended by D/L, DD/L, EO, & C/P+PS) subject matter came up and EO indicated he had directed P+PS to coordinate question 36 with PMS with all questions to all divisions and staffs. D/L commented that he didn't think it necessary to cover all points. I left the meeting without a clear direction on this matter.

STATINTL

While attending a meeting at Headquarters the following day, I asked my deputy, [redacted] to clarify this matter with the front office. I indicated anyone of the three could resolve it since all were at the RAP session. Bill talked to the D/L who gave him the following direction: No need to check with PMS since this action (prior to 1963) was before their activation (circa 1967) and the advent of CONIF. R+D was in PD at the time check with them. No need to fan all questions to all divisions and staffs.

Bill's action complied precisely with D/L advice and his checking w/ PD led him to OLSS whose search revealed certain documentation of which

Copies were obtained and appended to the memorandum for OLC dated 30 Jan 78. Following comments keyed to EO Note.

- a. All points coverage negated by direction from D/L
- b. PMS was not queried since it was not in existence in 1963-4 and D/L directed [redacted] to PD STATINTL
- c. When PD was queried we relied on their negative response. We checked no farther except with OL/SS
- d. My note to D/L merely raised the question since I too read paragraph 2 of the OLC memo (OLC 78-0070/1 - 12 Jan 78)
- e. I did not refer to the "surfaced" documents only the "clipped" document. The document referred to was a memo from C/OL/SS to C/PD dated 6 August 1962 relative to security clearances of 57 firms of which [redacted] was one. STAT

2a On 2/1/78 [redacted] checked w/PMs <sup>STATINTL</sup>  
(CONIF) - No record.

b. I called OTS Contracting Team 2/1/78 <sup>STATINTL</sup>  
and asked [redacted] <sup>STAT</sup>  
if they had any files, records or  
information on [redacted]  
Negative response.

c. On 2/1/78 I had [redacted] check <sup>STATINTL</sup>  
again w/PD (originally checked by DC/POPS  
on 1/24/78 and DC/PD advised no record  
in PD but DC/SS had some files) and <sup>STATINTL</sup>  
a folder was located in the facilities  
file under [redacted]  
and RD 109 TO 2, 3 + 5 were in  
Archives under Job Orders 64-506 Bx 11,  
and 64-132 Bx 11. These files are  
being recalled immediately and we  
should have them 2/2/78.

d (1) Copies of the TO's will be attached  
to the memo and it will be  
rewritten accordingly.

(2) I cannot comply with this  
unless I fan all 38 questions  
out to all divisions & staffs. During  
a conversation with EO 31 Jan  
he stated that the following  
was acceptable "Management  
has reviewed all questions  
contained in the Committee request  
which produced — — — — —"

*Review of Records.*

STAT

[Redacted]

MFR dated 6/29/72 hand-  
written by [Redacted] 04/SS STATINTL  
stating that [Redacted] from STATINTL

PSD/OS advised him that  
D/S decreed some years ago STAT  
that the Agency would  
not contract with [Redacted]  
[Redacted] - Reasons were not given.

STAT  
STATINTL

[Redacted]

STATINTL

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt